

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 18, 2007 has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-27 are pending in the application with claims 1, 9, 13, 21 and 25-27 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 9, 13, 21, and 25-27 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the above amendments to the claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on July 13, 2007. During this interview, the Applicants' representatives discussed the amendments to the claims reflected herein. The Examiner agreed that the inclusion of such recitations distinguish the claims over U.S. Patent No. 5,774,650 to Chapman et al. ("Chapman").

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

I. Pending Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9-12, 13-19, and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Chapman.

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer").

A. The Pending Claims are Not Anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,774,650 to Chapman et al.

Applicants respectfully submit amended independent claims 1, 9, 13, 21 and 25-27 are not anticipated by Chapman. As noted above, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include the recitation of "temporarily assigning an elevated access right." As agreed to during the interview, the inclusion of this recitation distinguishes the claims from Chapman because

Chapman does not teach or suggest this recitation. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9, 13, 21 and 25-27 are allowable over Chapman.

Claims 2-7, 10-12, 14-19, and 21-24 variously depend on 1, 9, 13, 21 and 25-27 and are allowable at least as being dependent on an allowable claim.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

B. The Pending Claims Are Not Obvious by Chapman in View of Meyer.

The Office Action rejects dependent claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to Meyer et al. (“Meyer”). “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 1, and Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 13. The Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Office Action did not reject independent claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection to claims 1 and 13 should be withdrawn and are allowable as shown above. The rejection of dependent claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with regard to the Chapman patent in view of the Meyer patent should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

An indication of allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited. Early notification of a favorable consideration is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to

Application No. 10/675,159
Amendment filed July 18, 2007
Response to Office Action dated April 18, 2007


charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: July 18, 2007

By:



Daniel G. Vivarelli, Jr.
Registration No. 51,137
Jonathan B. Burns
Registration No. 51,515

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

JBB:BMB/tmf